

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
	10/795,869	03/09/2004	Wen Hsiang Yang	LP4002-3850	1227		
7590 01/03/		90 01/03/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER		
	WEN HSIAN	G YANG		WONG, STEVEN B			
235 Chung-Ho Box 8-24				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	Taipei,			3711	3711		
	TAIWAN			DATE MAILED: 01/03/2009	5 ·		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Application I	No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary			10/795,869		YANG, WEN HSIANG				
			Examiner		Art Unit				
			Steven Wong	·	3711				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic r Reply	cation appea	ars on the co	ver sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statule, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).									
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed	d on							
·									
3)	secution as to the 3 O.G. 213.	e merits is							
Disposition of Claims									
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	4)  Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicati	on Papers								
<ul> <li>9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</li> <li>11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</li> </ul>									
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.									
2) Notic 3) Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F r No(s)/Mail Date		•	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal P Other:	ite	O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/795,869 Page 2

Art Unit: 3711

# Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the use of the language "wet-proof" is inaccurate in describing the structure for the ball. More appropriate language would "water-proof".

Appropriate correction is required.

subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
- 3. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 2, the scope of the claim is unclear as it defines the elastic bags as having a figure "8" shape. However, it appears that the cover itself comprises the figure "8" shape. Clarification is required.

In claim 3, the language "if" is indefinite in positively defining the structure for the invention.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Su et al. (4,815,737) in view of Smith (5,294,112). Regarding claim 1, Su discloses a baseball

Application/Control Number: 10/795,869

Art Unit: 3711

construction comprising a cover (10, 12), a bag (14) having an opening, and a cover (30, 32).

Note column 2, lines 21-23 stating that the bag is made from a conventional plastic material.

Thus, the bag is obviously formed from a material that is both elastic and waterproof. However,

Su lacks the teaching for a plurality of bags surrounding the core.

Smith reveals a game ball construction including a core (11) and a plurality of bags (12-16) that have openings that do not overlap one another (note Figures 2-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form the ball of Su with a plurality of bags in order to better reinforce the core of the ball and reduce the change of breakage of the bag.

Regarding claim 2, insofar as this claim may be understood, the structure is rendered obvious by Su since Su provides a cover (30, 32) comprising figure "8" shapes.

Regarding claim 3, the claim is rendered obvious by Su since Su provides a bag that does enclose the ball core.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Wong whose telephone number is 571-272-4416. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Vidovich can be reached on 571-272-4415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/795,869

Art Unit: 3711

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Steven Wong Primary/Examiner Art Unit 3711

SBW December 27, 2004